

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,061,056 to Menard et al. (herein "Menard").

Addressing the above rejection, initially applicants note each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify a feature recited therein. More particularly, independent claim 1 clarifies that the added program feature data "represents respective contents of the plural partial information". Such subject matter is believed to be clear from the original specification, for example at page 11, line 14 and in Figures 4 and 6. The other independent claims are similarly amended.

According to the claimed invention, a program database is formed by dividing multimedia information into plural partial information formed of a frame or frames, and program feature data representing respective contents of the plural partial information is added to the plural partial information. Thereby, the plural partial information is stored with respective added program feature data in the program database. As shown for example in Figure 4 in the present specification, different plural partial information can have added thereto the keywords "Politics", "Economy", and "Weather Forecast" representing contents of the respective plural partial information.

Further, in the claimed invention the partial information can be searched to find particular information in accord with user profile data. Further, when a match is found between the user profile data and the program feature data, the searched partial information can be read out from the database and provided to a user. Such features are believed to clearly distinguish over the teachings in Menard.

Menard does not teach or suggest that a program database is formed by dividing multimedia information into plural partial information formed of a frame or frames, and

respectively adding program feature data representing respective contents of the plural partial information to the plural partial information to be stored with the plural partial information.

Simply, the database of Menard does not store plural partial information with the added program feature data representing contents of the plural partial information. As a result, Menard does not further teach or suggest that partial information that accords with user profile data from the program database can be searched for based on a match between the user profile data and the program feature data, and further that the searched partial information is read from the database to provide the search to partial information to a user.

Menard merely teaches a database for storing data representing criteria and storing, when a program data stream matches a stored data, a program segment and a program data stream (see Menard at col. 1, lines 66 to col. 2, line 18).

In maintaining the outstanding rejection, the outstanding Office Action on pages 3-4 states:

[Menard] teaches and describes automatic broadcast monitoring system that compares monitored broadcast signals with stored data representing program content of interest to user, and records segment of program when stored data matches program data, i.e. searching and comparing program data with stored data [based on] user interest (profile). The system for monitoring standard broadcast signals receives broadcast signals, and includes a user selection unit for inputting criteria identifying program content of interest to the user. A database stores data representing the program content criteria, and a recognition device generates a program data stream representing the program content from the broadcast signals. A comparator compares the program data with the stored data, and an output device carries out predetermined action, e.g. recording a segment of the program, when the program data matches the stored data. The system can be configured to activate a window on a multimedia PC when pre-selected program material is present in the broadcast signals.

Thus, the system detects the content of broadcast signals of particular interest to individual viewers, e.g. monitoring world events for stock brokerage services, government organizations etc. and, the users can automatically be alerted as events occur. Therefore, the system enables automatic detection of content on

TV broadcast using computers, synchronizing and capturing incoming closed captioned text together with video and audio, and indexing and retrieval of individual sections of video and audio, based on content of e.g. closed caption text.

Therefore, the system of [Menard] teaches and describes a receiver device for automatically recording programs of user's interest using the information of an electronic program list send from broadcasting station.

Applicants clearly still have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts. [Original Emphasis].

The above-noted basis for the outstanding rejecting is traversed. Menard does not tech or suggest storing plural partial information with added program feature data that represents respective contents of the plural partial information. Menard merely teaches storing, when the received program data stream matches a stored data, a program segment and the program data associated therewith.¹ However, applicants note that is not what the claims recite.

The claims recite initially dividing multimedia information into plural partial information formed of a frame or frames. Then, program feature data representing contents of the plural partial information is added to the plural partial information to be stored therewith. The segment of the program noted above as stored in Menard does not represent a respective content of plural partial information divided from multimedia information.

Further, if the Office Action relies upon those recorded segments of the program in Menard to correspond to the claimed "plural partial information", it is clearly the case that in Menard those recorded segments are not later searched in accord with a user profile data.

The outstanding Office Action also relies upon Menard disclosing a second database at col. 3, lines 27-65 and col. 6, lines 4-14. In that respect, Menard does state in col. 6, lines 9-11 that "[i]ndividual sections of video and audio can be retrieved using SQL-like queries on

¹ Menard at col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 18.

the closed caption text". However, such an operation in Menard does not at all correspond to the claimed searching for program feature data in accordance with user profile data to find a program feature data that accords with the user profile data.

In such ways, the claims as currently written are believed to clearly distinguish over Menard.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
EHK/SNS/irs

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423